

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 19, 2008. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 19-22 and 24-30 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 11, 19 and 29 are in independent form. Claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 19 and 29 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 5, 13, 14-18, 23, 31 and 32 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. A substitute specification has been submitted in both a marked and a clean version; no new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings on the ground that they include reference characters not mentioned in the specification. This objection is obviated by the changes made in the accompanying substitute specification.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 19-21, 24-26 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,466,329 (Mukai). In addition, Claims 4 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from *Mukai* in view of U.S. Patent 5,042,619 (Kohno).

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an image forming system that comprises image forming means that forms an image relating to subject data on a recording medium having an RFID tag that stores identification information specific to the recording medium. Detecting means communicate with the RFID tag of the recording medium by a radio frequency communication and read the identification information from the RFID tag. In accordance with an image forming operation for an image relating to desired subject data by the image forming means, database means store first identification information that is

read by the detecting means from the RFID tag of a first recording medium on which the image relating to the desired subject data is recorded, and the desired subject data, in association with each other. Retrieving means retrieves subject data corresponding to the first identification information read by the detecting means from the RFID tag of the first recording medium on which the image relating to the desired subject data is recorded, from plural subject data stored in the database means, at a timing different from the image forming operation for the image relating to the desired subject data on the first recording medium, and control means, in accordance with a result of retrieval by the retrieving means, control the image forming means to form an image relating to the subject data corresponding to the first identification information retrieved by the retrieving means on a second recording medium different from the first recording medium.

Among other notable features of a system according to Claim 1 is that the storage of first identification information read from an RFID tag of a first recording medium on which an image relating to a desired subject data is recorded, and the desired subject data, in association with each other, and retrieval of subject data corresponding to the first identification information read from the RFID tag of the first recording medium on which the image relating to the desired subject data is recorded, from stored plural subject data at a timing different from an image forming operation for the image relating to the desired subject data on the first recording medium, to record an image relating to the retrieved subject data on a second recording medium different from the first recording medium.

*Mukai* relates to a system in which, when a master form printing is designated, a graphic code (bar code) indicating a page ID is printed, and print data of each

page is recorded on an HDD together with the page ID. In the case of copying, if an image obtained by a scanner includes the page ID (bar code), then the print data corresponding to the page ID included in the scanned image is read out from the HDD to be printed.

However, *Mukai* fails to suggest reading identification information from an RFID tag on a recording medium, and certainly does not suggest storing, in a database, identification information read out from the RFID tag, in association with subject data. In this connection, the following points should be noted:

1. *Mukai* detects the ID by reading a bar code printed on each page in the master form printing. This can take much time and a lot of trouble for the user, since it will be necessary to arrange a master form printed paper correctly at a predetermined position on the scanner as described in column 14, while a system according to Claim 1 does not entail such trouble since the identification information is simply read from the RFID.

2. *Mukai* does not read the bar code from the recording medium (sheet) in the master form printing, while the system of Claim 1 reads the identification information from the RFID tag on the first recording medium when an image is printed on the first recording medium to form a database.

3. *Mukai* records the page ID and the print data on the HDD when the master form printing is performed, while the system of Claim 1 stores the identification information read from the RFID in association with subject data.

For all these reasons, Applicant believe that it is clear that Claim 1 is allowable over *Mukai*.

U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0170973 (Teraura) relates to a system that stores software in an RFID provided on a print paper and discriminates whether or not copying is permissible, on the basis of information read from the RFID. However, this document does not disclose or suggest storing printed data together with identification information read from an RFID, much less retrieving print subject data on the basis of such identification information read from an RFID.

Applicant submits that even if these two documents are combined, the result would necessarily lack any suggestion of using an RFID tag on a print medium, reading information from such tag and storing the read information in association with subject image data, and retrieving the subject data based on the information from the tag, as in the system of Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that Claim 1 is allowable over any possible combination of *Mukai* and *Teraura*.

Independent Claim 11 also recites features similar in relevant respects to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. For example, Claim 11 recites that an image forming system reads identification information from an RFID tag of an arbitrary recording medium, and acquires subject data corresponding to the identification information read from the RFID tag of the arbitrary recording medium to form an image relating to the acquired subject data on a recording medium different from the arbitrary recording medium. Accordingly, it is believed to be clear that Claim 11 also is allowable over any possible combination of the two documents discussed above.

Independent Claims 19 and 29 are method claims corresponding respectively to system Claims 1 and 11, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with the latter claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200